Assessment and Validation of Cone Beam Computed Tomography in the Localization and Volume Estimation of Foreign Bodies in the Maxillary Sinus

Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine,
Cairo University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Doctor's Degree in Oral Radiology.

By:

Alaa Adel Mohammed Nawwar

Assistant Lecturer, Oral Radiology Department BDS (2002), MSc. (2008). Cairo University

Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine
Cairo University
2014

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

﴿ وَعَلَّمَكَ مَا لَمْ تَكُن تَعْلَمُ وَكَانَ فَضْلُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْكَ عَظِيماً ﴾

صدق الله العظيم سورة النساء آية (١١٣)

Supervisors

Prof. Amr Abdel Azim

Professor of Oral Radiology

Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine

Cairo University

Prof. Nashwa Salah Mohamed

Professor of Oral Radiology

Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine

Cairo University

Contents

| Title | Page |
|-----------------------|------|
| List of figures | i |
| List of tables | iv |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Review of Literature | 4 |
| Aim of the Study | 52 |
| Materials and Methods | 53 |
| Results | 70 |
| Discussion | 78 |
| Summary | 87 |
| Conclusions | 90 |
| Recommendations | 91 |
| References | 92 |
| Arabic Summary | |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements

First of all, I thank Allah for helping and guiding me throughout this work.

I would like to express my endless gratefulness to **Professor Dr. Amr A. Azim**, Professor of Oral Radiology, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine,

Cairo University, for his support and guidance throughout this study.

I am most grateful to **Professor Dr. Nashwa Salah Mohamed**, Professor of Oral Radiology, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University, for her generous help and valuable advice.

I am indebted to **Professor Dr. Mushira Dahaba**, Head of department and Professor of Oral Radiology, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University, for her continuous encouragement and motivation.

I would like to thank **Professor Dr Mohamed Ekram**, Professor of Oral Radiology, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University,

Dr Amr Ekram, **Dr Khaled Ekram**, lecrurers Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University and **Engineer Tarek Khafagy**, for their continuous help and co-operation regarding the practical work in this study.

I would also like to thank all the staff members of the **Oral Radiology Department, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University**, for their encouragement and support.

Last, but never least, I thank my husband, and my family for their endless love and support, without which, this work would have not been possible.

List of Figures

| Figure | Title | Page |
|--------|---|------|
| 1 | The Maxillary sinus and surrounding bony structures | 4 |
| 2 | Schematic superposition of the geometric volume of the maxillary sinus and definition of sinus walls. | 6 |
| 3 | Periapical Radiograph: showing the maxillary sinus. | 12 |
| 4 | Occlusal Radiograph: showing the lateral walls of the maxillary sinus. | 12 |
| 5 | A: Occipitomental View, B: Lateral skull View. | 13 |
| 6 | Panoramic Radiograph: showing the maxillary sinus. | 14 |
| 7 | Principle of Helical CT. | 17 |
| 8 | Cone Beam CT. | 19 |
| 9 | Differences in beam geometry: A: fan shaped beam: conventional CT imaging, B: cone shaped beam: CBCT. | 21 |
| 10 | Examples of different FOVs. A: Large FOV, B: Medium C: Focused or restricted FOV. | 23 |
| 11 | Acquisition of CBCT images. | 26 |
| 12 | Comparison of volume data sets: A: isotropic as in CBCT, and B: anisotropic, as in conventional CT. | 28 |
| 13 | X-ray beam projection scheme of acquisition geometry of A: cone beam imaging and B:conventional CT. | 29 |
| 14 | CBCT images of a bony pathology, a: Reformatted panoramic image, b: multiple cross sectional slices. | 31 |
| 15 | 3D visualization techniques: A: ray sum, B: maximum intensity projection and C: volumetric transparent. | 33 |
| 16 | The projections of three x-ray beams, from a point of origin, are shown at two positions of the x-ray tube. | 40 |

| Figure | Title | Page |
|--------|---|------|
| 17 | Three images of periodontal furcation involvement of a second molar. A: furcation involvement, B: facial-lingual extent, C: extent of the lesion on the axial view. | 42 |
| 18 | CBCT images of an orthodontic case, A: axial cut, B: serial sagittal cuts, C: reformatted panoramic image and D: 3D reconstruction. | 43 |
| 19 | CBCT images (views) of a mandibular cyst: A: mesial, B: anterior, C: lingual, D:cross-sectional and E:panoramic. | 45 |
| 20 | CBCT images showing the condylar morphology, A: coronal view and B: sagittal view | 46 |
| 21 | CBCT images for dental implant planning. A: panoramic, B: cross-sectional views showing the mandibular nerve. | 47 |
| 22 | CBCT images of the orthogonal views of maxillary sinus: A: axial, B: coronal and C: sagittal view. | 49 |
| 23 | CBCT image showing maxillary sinus pneumatization. | 49 |
| 24 | The dummy skull model (Implant Bone ®). | 54 |
| 25 | A: Implant placed against the medial wall of the sinus B: Implant placed against the anterior wall of the sinus. | 55 |
| 26 | A: Implant placed against the center of the sinus. B: Implant placed against the lateral wall of the sinus. | 55 |
| 27 | Gutta percha sticks, to act as reference points. | 56 |
| 28 | Digital caliper. | 57 |
| 29 | Measurements taken: from the tip of the implant to the tip of the reference point. | 57 |
| 30 | A sensitive weight scale. | 58 |
| 31 | CBCT Machine, Scanora3D, Sarodex, Finland. | 60 |
| 32 | Scanning of the model. | 60 |
| 33 | The model in the scanning position. | 61 |

| Figure | Title | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| 34 | CBCT software, OnDemand3D. | 62 |
| 35 | An axial view of the model. | 63 |
| 36 | Coronal and sagittal views of the model. | 64 |
| 37 | Axial view of the model. | 65 |
| 38 | Sagittal view of the model. | 65 |
| 39 | Taking measurements from the CBCT scan. | 66 |
| 40 | Mimics software, calculating the implant's Mask Volume. | 68 |
| 41 | Mimics software, calculating the 3D Volume. | 68 |
| 42 | Reformatted panoramic image. | 69 |
| 43 | Bar chart:comparison between actual and CBCT | 71 |
| | measurements for implants against the anterior wall. | |
| 44 | Bar chart:comparison between actual and CBCT | 72 |
| | measurements for implants against the lateral wall. | |
| 45 | Bar chart: comparison between actual and CBCT | 73 |
| | measurements for implants against the medial wall. | |
| 46 | Bar chart: comparison between actual and CBCT | 74 |
| | measurements for implants in the center of the sinus. | |
| 47 | Bar chart: comparison between actual volume measurements | 76 |
| | and Mimics software volume measurements (Mask and 3D). | |

List of Tables

| Table | Title | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 1 | The mean, standard deviation and results of actual and | 71 |
| | CBCT measurements for implants against the anterior | |
| | wall. | |
| 2 | The mean, standard deviation and results of actual and | 72 |
| | CBCT measurements for implants against the lateral | |
| _ | wall. | |
| 3 | The mean, standard deviation and results of actual and | 73 |
| | CBCT measurements for implants medial the anterior | |
| 4 | wall. | 7.1 |
| 4 | The mean, standard deviation and results of actual and | 74 |
| | CBCT measurements for implants in the center of the | |
| 5 | Sinus. Descrite of Crombook's almbo reliability as officient for | 75 |
| 5 | Results of Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for inter-examiner agreement for linear measurements. | 75 |
| | inter-examiner agreement for intear measurements. | |
| 6 | Results of Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for | 75 |
| | intra- examiner agreement for linear measurements. | |
| 7 | The mean, standard deviation and results of repeated | 76 |
| | measures ANOVA and Tukey's tests for comparison | |
| | between actual volume measurements and Mimics | |
| | software measurements (cm ³). | |
| 8 | Frequencies and percentages (%) of correct and | 77 |
| | incorrect detection of implant position by the three | |
| | examiners. | |
| | | |
| 9 | Results of Kappa statistics for the agreement between | 77 |
| | the examiners in the detection of correct implant | |
| | position. | |
| | | |

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Formation of the paranasal sinuses occurs fetal life. late in each of the paranasal cavities (maxillary, ethmoid, frontal, and sphenoid sinuses) is enclosed by its corresponding craniofacial bone (Zarbo et al, 2011). The maxillary sinus is the largest of the paranasal sinuses and is situated in the body of the maxilla. Its anterior wall is the facial surface of this bone, and its posterior wall is the infratemporal surface. The roof of the maxillary sinus is the floor of the orbit and its medial wall is the lateral wall of the nasal cavity (**Baily et al, 2006**).

The bone of the maxillary sinus floor can be very thin, and in some individuals, the roots of the premolars and posterior teeth project through the sinus floor, into the sinus (**Abe et al, 1992**).

Liston, 2002, stated that great care must be taken during dental treatment not to accidentally introduce foreign bodies into the antrum. Bassam, 2010, added that the increased pneumatization of the maxillary sinus and decreased alveolar bone thickness can often be observed after extraction of premolars and molars, which would complicate placement of implants.

Foreign bodies found in the maxillary sinus include tooth roots, burs, dental impression material, root-filling materials, dental implants, and needles (Laskin and Dierks, 1999).

In most cases, these materials gain entry via oroantral communication. In some less-common cases, materials gain access to the sinuses via a tooth socket, via the pulp chamber of a tooth, or during an operation near the antrum (**Dimitrakopoulos and Papadaki, 2008**).

According to **Tanasiewicz et al, 2013**, prompt surgical intervention to remove a foreign body from the maxillary sinus is recommended to prevent possible sequelae of acute or chronic sinusitis or mucosal cyst formation.

Saunders et al, 2000, stated that plain radiographs play an important role in the management of dentomaxillofacial lesions especially for detection, treatment, and follow up of bone lesions. Furthermore, Ikeda, et al 1998, and Fernandez, 2000, added that the evaluation of maxillary sinus can be performed using plain radiographs (lateral and frontal) and Computed tomography scans. Lateral and frontal head films offer limited information about the maxillary sinus, with the inherent errors of a two dimensional representation of a three dimensional structure.

Cone bone computed tomography (CBCT) represents the latest generation in medical imaging and has become a well-accepted tool for oral and maxillofacial diagnosis and treatment planning. This is mainly due to its advantages over conventional computed tomography, which include lower effective radiation dose, lower costs, easy access and shorter acquisition times. (Marti, 2007 and Guijarro-Martínez and Swennen, 2011).

2

Rafferty et al, 2005, concluded that CBCT imaging yields high quality images of skeletal anatomy, soft tissues and air-filled spaces, while exposing the patients to lower levels of radiation. Therefore, CBCT is a highly useful method in examining the maxillary sinuses and aiding in endoscopic surgery of the sinuses.

In order to avoid disadvantages such as superposition of anatomic structures, horizontal and vertical magnification and a lack of cross-sectional information that are associated with panoramic radiographs, the present study will be conducted using CBCT images to localize and estimate the volume of foreign bodies in the maxillary sinus.